Women Reservation Bill

806. SHRI PRAVEEN RASHTRAPAL: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) the efforts made by Government to introduce the Women Reservation Bill in Parliament;

(b) why such a vital issue is delayed inspite of declared policy of UPA Government for empowerment of women; and

(c) the action proposed by Government in this matter?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ): (a) to (c) With the objective of evolving a consensus on Women Reservation Bill, a meeting was called by the Chairperson of United Progressive Alliance (UPA) on 22.8.2005 in which the constituents of UPA and Left Parties participated and subsequently the Hon'ble Prime Minister held a meeting with the Leaders of National Democratic Alliance (NDA) and other Leaders on 24th August, 2005. However, there was no consensus on the provisions of the Bill in both the above meetings. The main objection to the concept of reservation for women in Lok Sabha appears to arise from the rotational phenomenon which would break the link between the Member of Parliament and his/her constituency. These apprehensions are required to be removed before the Government could bring a new Bill in the Parliament.

Pending cases and appointment of judges in High Courts

807. SHRI PRAVEEN RASHTRAPAL: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) the number of pending cases in High Courts, State-wise;

(b) the number of judges required in those courts to clear the pending cases; and

(c) the reasons for delay in making appointments in various High Courts, inspite of requirement and receipt of panel from State level?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI K. VENKATAPATHY): (a) A Statement is enclosed (*See* below).

(b) In pursuance of the judgment of the Supreme Court of October 6, 1993 in the Supreme Court Advocates on Record & Anrs. *Vs.* the Union of India, the judge strength of the High Courts is reviewed every three years. The last trienninal review was undertaken in the year 2006 whereby it is proposed to increase the judge strength by 106 Judges in 8 High Courts, subject to concurrence of the concerned State Governments, taking the number of approved strength trom 726 prior to review to 832.

(c) As per the judgment of Supreme Court of October 6, 1993 in the Supreme Court Advocates on Record & Anrs. *Vs.* the Union of India, the Chief Justice of a High Court has to initiate the proposal for filling up the vacancy and recommend the name to the Chief Minister of the State. On receipt of the comments/views of the Chief Minister of the State through the Governor, the Union Government together with their own inputs refers the proposals to the Chief Justice of India for his advice. On receipt of the advice from the Chief Justice of India, the proposal is submitted